

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Claims 3-8 and 12-13 were objected to for informalities. These informalities have been remedied by the amendments to the claims above. Withdrawal of these objections is requested.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to claim 7, the one link refers to either one of the communications link or the second communications link for the gaming components inside the cabinet and the link used by gaming components is the other of the links. This has been clarified by amendments to the claims above. It is submitted that these amendments, as well as those to claim 16, overcome the rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin (US Publication No. 2003/0014370).

The office action states that Charrin teaches that the capability of transferring data between the components in paragraph 0042. However, the disclosure of paragraph 0042 merely describes how the bill acceptor communicates with a card reader and then the card reader communicates to the host. The paragraph continues, stating, "In a preferred embodiment, the card reader 202 effectively provides a pass-through connection from the bill acceptor 204 to the host device 208 when the combined bill acceptor and card reader unit 201 is operating in the cash mode." It is apparent that there is no peer-to-peer, hostless communication occurring between the bill acceptor and the card reader. The card reader is merely a conduit of information between the bill acceptor and the host device. This does not anticipate two gaming component communicating as peers without a host.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly show that the peer-to-peer communication between gaming components is without a host. As discussed above, this not shown by the prior art. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-6 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. The prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-6 and 8-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 7 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin in view of Stockdale et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0187830).

Stockdale is directed to a gaming system in which the peripheral components communicate with a master gaming controller. Charrin is also directed to peripheral components communicating with a master controller, not between themselves in a peer-to-peer fashion without a host.

Claims 7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims, with regard to Charrin. Stockdale, for the reasons cited above, does not overcome the limitations of Charrin, as Stockdale does not address peer-to-peer communication in any form. It is therefore submitted that claims 7 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 11, the combination of references does not teach peer-to-peer communication between the gaming components on a communications link inside a cabinet or a communications link outside the cabinet. Claim 11 has been amended to more clearly show that these communication links are peer-to-peer, which is not shown, taught nor suggested by the prior art as discussed above. It is therefore submitted that claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-16 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Further, with regard to the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-6, the office action had stated that Charrin teaches the components communicating in a peer-to-peer manner. While that characterization of Charrin is incorrect for the reasons discussed above, if it were, the combination of references would be invalid. Charrin would be teaching away from Stockdale and therefore there would be no suggestion in either reference to modify the teachings in accordance with the other reference. Therefore, either Charrin teaches peer-to-peer communication and is invalidly combined with Stockdale, or Charrin does not teach peer-to-peer communication and neither reference in the combination show, teaches or suggests the invention as claimed.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed

Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 20575

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613